



MAIL: 1731 Howe Ave, PMB #352, Sacramento, CA 95825-2209
PHONE: (800) 464-3597 • E-Mail: luky@safetycenter.org

September 1, 2011

Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Office of the Governor
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, California 95814

Re: Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs

Dear Governor Brown:

The California Association of Drinking Driver Treatment Programs (CADDTP) represents the majority of driving-under-the-influence (DUI) education and counseling programs licensed by the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP). Our relationship to the Department goes back more than two decades.

There is discussion that ADP is to be eliminated and some of its functions transferred to other state agencies or individual county governments, including the licensing and monitoring services for DUI programs. These DUI program services are provided at no taxpayer expense, since the programs reimburse ADP for the expenses incurred in its licensing and monitoring activities.

I am writing to you on behalf of CADDTP to request that the DUI program activities remain in a restructured ADP that includes the DUI and other self-supporting activities it now conducts. ADP and the programs have developed a working relationship that the members of CADDTP believe is benefitting the citizens of California through the reduction of repeat DUI offenses, as indicated in the research noted below.

If a transfer of DUI program activities is ultimately deemed necessary, the members of CADDTP believe that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is best equipped to handle them. For instance:

- DMV's Research and Development Branch has been compiling data on the effectiveness of DUI programs in reducing subsequent DUI incidents since 1990 and has found them to be a principal reason for the reduction of DUI recidivism, according to the Annual Report of the DUI Management Information System, as published by DMV.
- DMV's Driver Safety Branch has day-to-day dealings with DUI program enrollees, as well as with the programs themselves, regarding a wide range of issues. In fact,

Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
September 1, 2011
Page Two

Senate Bill 1696 (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2004) and Senate Bill 1697 (Chapter 551, Statutes of 2004) dramatically increased DMV's involvement with DUI offenders and DUI programs in the post-conviction phase.

- DMV has experience in the licensing and monitoring of other drinking driver involved programs, including the vendors of ignition interlock devices. These devices are now part of almost every post-conviction requirement for DUI offenders.

While transfer of funded programs from ADP to individual counties may be desirable, CADDTP's members believe such a transfer would have a significantly negative effect of the DUI program system. For example, after the passage of Assembly Bill 541 (Moorhead – chapter citation unavailable), counties had the opportunity to administer programs for first DUI offenders with minimal standards established in law. The result was a "mishmash" of almost 58 different programs that were deemed basically ineffective in reducing recidivism (Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation) and statewide standards were called for. Senate Bill 1344 (Seymour – chapter citation unavailable) provided a remedy, and subsequent DMV research established the effectiveness of the standardized, state (ADP) licensed and monitored first offender programs.

CADDTP's members appreciate the difficult choices you must make to deal with California's fiscal issues. The above recommendations are based on our members' cumulative experience in the DUI field. Our association stands ready to assist you in any way you deem helpful.

Sincerely,



Luky Maldonado, Chair
CADDTP Board of Directors

LM/mdc

copy: Michael Cunningham, Acting Director, ADP
CADDTP Organizational Members